

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested. Regarding the status of the Office Action, there is an inconsistency in the Office Action in that the Office Action Summary (Page 1) indicates that the current Office Action is a non-final Office Action, while the Conclusion section (Page 6) indicates that the Office Action is made final. In a telephone conversation with the Examiner on February 27, 2007, the undersigned confirmed with the Examiner that the current Office Action is a final Office Action.

Claims 1-24 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1-15 and 22-24 are allowed. Claims 18 and 21 are objected to. Claims 16-17 and 19-20 are rejected. This amendment is believed to place the application in condition for allowance, and entry therefore is respectfully requested. In the alternative, entry of this amendment is requested as placing the application in better condition for appeal by, at least, reducing the number of issues outstanding.

Entry of Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

The Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response because the Examiner has newly cited a reference not previously made of record in rejecting the claims and the amendment does not alter the scope of the claims and places the application at least into a better form for purposes of appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103

In the Office Action, at pages 2-3, claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,822) and in view of Ninh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,705,860).

The Examiner concedes that Sekine et al. does not disclose the surface of one of the connection parts of the second chassis part is made of non-conductive material. Ninh et al. fails to make up for this deficiency in Sekine et al. Specifically, Ninh et al. does not discuss or suggest “wherein a surface of one of the connection parts at the second chassis part connecting to the one of the connection parts at the first chassis part is made of non-conductive material,” as recited in claim 16. In other words, the invention of claim 16 provides that one of the connection parts of the second chassis has a *non-conductive material on its surface*. Ninh et al., as relied on by the Examiner, merely discloses that optoelectric connectors, such as LEDs and fiber optics, would not be optimum for the connection of the display unit chassis provided in Ninh et al. because of interface and connection design problems, also noting that a key feature of the invention is minimizing the difficulty of installation and maintenance of the system. Ninh et al. makes no mention of providing connectors having a *non-conductive surface*.

Furthermore, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the highest connection part be rigid in order to provide the phone hinge structure of Sekine et al. It is respectfully submitted that this is not a proper motivation. The rigidity of the connection part is not addressed by the invention of claim 16 and the rigidity of the connection part has no relation to whether the connection part is provided with a non-conductive material on the surface. As discussed above, Ninh et al. makes no mention of providing connectors having a non-conductive surface and is only directed to a display unit chassis for use in an in-flight entertainment system. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to apply a portable telephone device of Sekine et al. with the airline entertainment system of Ninh et al. Even if Sekine et al. and Ninh et al. were combined, the invention of claim 16 would not result.

Since neither Sekine et al. and Ninh et al. discusses or suggests all of the features of the invention of claim 16, there is no proper motivation to combine Sekine et al. and Ninh et al., and even if Sekine et al. and Ninh et al. were combined, the invention of claim 16 would not result, claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Sekine et al. and Ninh et al., and the combination thereof. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-18 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 16, and include all the features of claim 16, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 17-18 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, at pages 3-4, claims 19-20 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekine et al. in view of Ninh et al. and further in view of Miller (U.S. Patent No. 5,784,251).

As discussed above, the invention of claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Sekine et al. and Ninh et al., and the combination thereof. Furthermore, Miller does not make up for this deficiency as it relates to the invention of claim 16. Claims 19-20 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 16, and include all the features of claim 16, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 19-20 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, at pages 5-6, claims 18 and 21 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As discussed above, none of the cited prior art discusses or suggests all of the features of the invention of claim 16. Claim 18 depends directly from claim 16, and includes all the features of claim 16, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the cited prior art. Therefore, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the reasons noted above. Thus, it is submitted that claim 18 is in a condition suitable for allowance.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner erred in objecting to claim 21 in this manner. Claim 21 depends from claim 1, which has been indicated as allowed by the Examiner. Thus, it is submitted that claim 21 is in a condition suitable for allowance. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 1-15 and 22-24 are allowed.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the patentability of the pending claims over the references and rejections record have been clearly set forth and, there being no other objections or rejections, that the application is in condition for allowance, which Action is respectfully requested. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-28-07

By: 

Aaron C. Walker
Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501